US v. Alton May Appeal: 14-7677 Doc: 8 Filed: 02/19/2015 Pg: 1 of 3

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-7677

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ALTON CHARLES MAY, a/k/a Chuckie, a/k/a John Dieudonne, a/k/a Nieem,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt. Roger W. Titus, Senior District Judge. (8:12-cr-00278-RWT-1; 8:14-cv-02999-RWT)

Submitted: February 12, 2015 Decided: February 19, 2015

Before MOTZ, WYNN, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Alton Charles May, Appellant Pro Se. Leah Bressack, Assistant United States Attorney, Greenbelt, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Doc. 405348015

PER CURIAM:

Alton Charles May seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) motions. The orders are not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(B) (2012). A certificate appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2012). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating jurists would find that the district court's reasonable assessment of the constitutional claims is debatable or wrong. Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); see Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003). When the district court denies relief on procedural grounds, the prisoner demonstrate both that the dispositive procedural ruling is debatable, and that the motion or underlying habeas application states a debatable claim of the denial of a constitutional right. Reid v. Angelone, 369 F.3d 363, 371 (4th Cir. 2004).

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that May has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal Appeal: 14-7677 Doc: 8 Filed: 02/19/2015 Pg: 3 of 3

contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED